1	William A. Hanssen (Bar No. 110613) Suzanne V. Stouder (Bar No. 161077)  COPY
2	DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP  333 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1650  Los Angeles, CA 90071-1504  CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
4	Telephone: (213) 253-2300 Facsimile: (213) 253-2301 William.hanssen@dbr.com Suzanne.stouder@dbr.com
5 6 7	Attorneys for Plaintiffs LEXINGTON INSURANCE COMPANY, NATIONAL UNION FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY OF PITTSBURGH, PA, AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL UNDERWRITERS INSURANCE COMPANY AND
8	CHARTIS SPECIALTY INSURANCE COMPANY  UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10 11 12	FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY OF (C)
	PITTSBURGH, PA, AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL UNDERWRITERS INSURANCE COMPANY, AND CHARTIS SPECIALTY INSURANCE COMPANY,
15	Plaintiffs,
16	vs.
17	MGA ENTERTAINMENT, INC.,
18	Defendants.
19	
20	
21	Plaintiffs Lexington Insurance Company ("Lexington"), National Union Fire
22	Insurance Company of Pittsburgh, PA ("National Union"), American International
23	Underwriters Insurance Company ("AIU") and Chartis Specialty Insurance
24	Company ("Chartis Specialty") (formerly known as American International
25	Specialty Lines Insurance Company) (collectively, "Plaintiffs") complain of the
26	above-named Defendant as follows:
27	///
28	///
LAW OFFICES DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP Los Angeles	LA01/ 344804.1 1 COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF

```
William A. Hanssen (Bar No. 110613)
            Suzanne V. Stouder (Bar No. 161077)
            DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
            333 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1650
            Los Angeles, CA 90071-1504
            Telephone: (213) 253-2300 Facsimile: (213) 253-2301
         4
            William.hanssen@dbr.com
            Suzanne.stouder@dbr.com
         5
            Attorneys for Plaintiffs
            LEXINGTON INSURANCE COMPANY, NATIONAL UNION FIRE
            INSURANCE COMPANY OF PITTSBURGH, PA, AMERICAN
            INTERNATIONAL UNDERWRITERS INSURANCE COMPANY AND
            CHARTIS SPECIALTY INSURANCE COMPANY
         8
                                UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
         9
                              CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
        10
            LEXINGTON INSURANCE
                                                   Case No.
            COMPANY, NATIONAL UNION
        11
            FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY OF
            PITTSBURGH, PA, AMERICAN
                                                   COMPLAINT FOR
            INTERNATIONAL UNDERWRITERS
                                                   DECLARATORY RELIEF
            INSURANCE COMPANY, AND CHARTIS SPECIALTY INSURANCE
        14
            COMPANY,
        15
                       Plaintiffs,
        16
                  VS.
        17
            MGA ENTERTAINMENT, INC.,
                       Defendants.
        18
        19
        20
                 Plaintiffs Lexington Insurance Company ("Lexington"), National Union Fire
        21
            Insurance Company of Pittsburgh, PA ("National Union"), American International
        22
            Underwriters Insurance Company ("AIU") and Chartis Specialty Insurance
        23
            Company ("Chartis Specialty") (formerly known as American International
        24
            Specialty Lines Insurance Company) (collectively, "Plaintiffs") complain of the
        25
            above-named Defendant as follows:
            ///
        27
            III
        28
            LA01/344804.1
 LAW OFFICES
DRINKER BIDDLE &
                                     COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF
  REATH LLP
  Los Angeles
```

THE PARTIES ł 1. Lexington is a Massachusetts corporation that maintains its principal 2 place of business in Boston, Massachusetts. 3 2. National Union is a Pennsylvania corporation that maintains its 4 principal place of business in New York, New York. 5 AIU is a New York corporation that maintains its principal place of 6 business in New York, New York. 7 8 4. Chartis Specialty is an Alaskan corporation that maintains its principal 9 place of business in New York, New York. 5. 10 On information and belief, Defendant MGA Entertainment, Inc. ("MGA") is a California corporation that maintains its principal place of business in 11 Van Nuys, California. 12 13 **JURISDICTION** This is an action, in part, for declaratory judgment pursuant to 28 14 6. U.S.C. §2201 for the purpose of determining an actual controversy between the 15 parties. Jurisdiction is based on the diversity of citizenship between the parties. The 16 amount in controversy exceeds the sum of \$75,000 exclusive of interest and costs. 17 18 Jurisdiction is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1332. 19 VENUE 7. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§1391(a)(3) 20 because MGA resides, may be found, and transacts business in this District. 21 NATURE OF ACTION 22 8. Plaintiffs seek a declaration that they are not obligated to defend or 23 indemnify MGA pursuant to certain primary and excess commercial umbrella 24 liability insurance policies in connection with a complaint brought against MGA in 25 26 the action captioned as Bernard Belair v. MGA Entertainment, Inc. and Mattel, Inc., Case No. 09-CIV-8870 pending in the United State District Court for the Southern 27 28 District of New York (the "Underlying Action").

LAW OFFICES

DRINKER BIDDLE &
REATH LLP
Los Angeles

LA01/344804.1

9. Declaratory judgment is appropriate in this matter because MGA has demanded insurance coverage from Plaintiffs with respect to the Underlying Action and Plaintiffs dispute their asserted obligations to provide such coverage.

#### THE POLICIES

- 10. Upon information and belief, ABC International Traders, Inc. ("ABC") is the predecessor in interest to MGA.
- 11. Lexington issued to MGA two primary commercial general liability policies: Policy Number 0308552 with a policy term of January 1, 2006 to January 1, 2007; and Policy Number 0350122 with a policy term of January 1, 2007 to January 1, 2008 (collectively referred to herein as the "2006 and 2007 Primary Policies"). Copies of those policies are attached hereto as Exhibits "1" and "2" respectively and are incorporated by reference.
- 12. AIU issued to ABC an excess commercial umbrella liability insurance policy, Policy Number BE 357-65-76 with a policy term of January 1, 1999 to January 1, 2000 (the "1999 Excess Policy"). A copy of this policy is attached hereto as Exhibit "3" and is incorporated by reference.
- 13. National Union issued to ABC two excess commercial umbrella liability insurance policies: Policy Number BE 739-31-37 with a policy term of February 24, 2000 to January 1, 2001 (the "2000 Excess Policy"); and Policy No. BE 740-82-85 with a policy term of January 1, 2001 to January 1, 2002 (the "2001 Excess Policy"). Copies of those policies are hereto as Exhibits "4" and "5" respectively and are incorporated by reference.
- 14. Chartis Specialty issued to ABC an excess commercial umbrella liability insurance policy, Policy Number BE 7413666 with a policy term of January 1, 2002 to January 1, 2003 (the "2002 Excess Policy"). Chartis Specialty also issued to MGA five excess commercial umbrella liability insurance policies: Policy Number BE 9745160 with a policy term of January 1, 2003 to January 1, 2004 (the "2003 Excess Policy"); Policy Number BE7414713 with a policy term of

LA01/344804.1

I	January 1, 2004 to January 1, 2005 (the "2004 Excess Policy"); Policy Number
2	BE7414970 with a policy term of January 1, 2005 to January 1, 2006 (the "2005
3	Excess Policy"); Policy Number BE9746430 with a policy term of January 1, 2006
4	to January 1, 2007 (the "2006 Excess Policy"); and Policy Number BE7411433 with
5	a policy term of January 1, 2007 to March 1, 2008 (the "2007 Excess Policy").
6	Copies of those policies are attached hereto as Exhibits "6" through "11,"
7	respectively, and are incorporated by reference. Collectively, Plaintiffs' policies
8	shall be referred to herein as the "Policies."
9	THE UNDERLYING ACTION
10	15. In the Underlying Action, Plaintiff Bernard Belair ("Belair") filed a
11	Complaint against MGA and Mattel, Inc. on October 20, 2009. On
12	December 10, 2009, Belair filed an Amended Complaint (the
13	"Amended Complaint").
14	16. The Amended Complaint alleges that in the later 1990s, Belair created
15	a series of images to be used in advertisements for Steve Madden shoes that featured
16	figures with large heads, large oval eyes, small bodies and large feet.
17	17. Belair alleges that Carter Bryant testified during the action styled as
18	Carter Bryant v. Mattel, Inc., Case No. 04-09049 (the "Bryant Action") that his
19	Bratz doll sketches were inspired by the Steve Madden shoe advertisements that he
20	saw in Seventeen Magazine. Belair further alleges that there was additional
21	testimony in the Bryant Action that the Bratz sculpts were inspired by a Steve
22	Madden shoe advertisement given to the sculptor by Carter Bryant.
23	18. Belair alleges that the Bratz dolls and sketches were copied, or
24	derivative, from the Steve Madden images and that he has suffered damages as a
25	result of MGA's and Mattel's infringement of Belair's copyrighted images.
26	19. Belair alleges that MGA has infringed Belair's copyrighted Belair
27	images by copying the Belair images to create the Bratz line of dolls, toys, games

28

LA01/344804.1

and videos, by creating derivative works of the Belair images in the Bratz line of

dolls, toys, games and videos and by distributing and selling the Bratz line of dolls, 1 toys, games and videos all without the permission of Belair. 2 Based on these allegations, Belair claims, inter alia, copyright 20. 3 infringement, unjust enrichment (against Mattel only) and seeks actual damages, 4 statutory damages, disgorgement of Mattel's unjust enrichment, attorney's fees, 5 declaratory and injunctive relief. 6 Belair alleges that MGA and Mattel willfully infringed his 21. 7 copyrighted works. 8 TRIAL OF THE BRYANT ACTION 9 During trial in the Bryant Action, undisputed testimony established that 22.. 10 the first publication of the allegedly infringing Carter Bryant sketches took place in 11 2000. Specifically, Isaac Larian, the CEO of MGA, testified under oath that the Bratz sketches/two-dimensional prototypes were first exhibited in the United States 13 in November of 2000. In addition, Isaac Larian testified that presentations of Carter Bryant's sketches and two-dimensional Bratz doll prototypes were used to market Bratz to Kmart and Target in November of 2000. 16 23. Moreover, an email dating December 14, 2000 was introduced into 17 evidence in the Bryant action. That email was sent to a Walmart buying agent in China and Hong Kong and attached drawings of the Bratz dolls with Carter Bryant's signature. 20 TENDER AND RESPONSE 21 By letter dated October 27, 2009, MGA provided Plaintiffs with notice 22 24. of the claims asserted in the Underlying Action. 23 24 25. By letters dated March 30, 2010, Plaintiffs reserved all of their rights and defenses under the Policies. As indicated herein, it is Plaintiffs' position that they are not obligated to defend or indemnify MGA in connection with the 26 Underlying Action at this time. 27 28 LA01/344804.1

LAW OFFICES
DRINKER BIDDLE &
REATH LLP
Los Angeles

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF

## 

## 

# 

LAW OFFICES
DRINKER BIDDLE &
REATH LLP

Los Angeles

LA01/344804.1

## COUNT I

DECLARATORY RELIEF

## (No Coverage For Claims of Copyright Infringement)

- 26. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 25 as though fully set forth at length herein.
- 27. The 1999 Excess Policy, the 2000 Excess Policy, 2001 Excess Policy, the 2002 Excess Policy, the 2003 Excess Policy, the 2004 Excess Policy, the 2005 Excess Policy, and the 2006 and 2007 Primary Policies are only potentially implicated by claims that fall within the coverage grant and are not excluded by any exclusions. The only claim that is even potentially covered by those Policies is the claim against MGA involving allegations of copyright infringement.
- 28. The 1999 Excess Policy, the 2000 Excess Policy, 2001 Excess Policy, the 2002 Excess Policy, the 2003 Excess Policy, the 2004 Excess Policy, the 2005 Excess Policy, and the 2006 and 2007 Primary Policies are only potentially implicated by claims of copyright infringement when such copyright infringement arises solely out of the insured's advertising.
- 29. The allegations of the Underlying Action do not claim that the alleged copyright infringement arose solely out of MGA's advertising. As a result, there is no potential coverage under the 1999 Excess Policy, the 2000 Excess Policy, 2001 Excess Policy, the 2002 Excess Policy, the 2003 Excess Policy, the 2004 Excess Policy, the 2005 Excess Policy, or the 2006 and 2007 Primary Policies for the claims of copyright infringement.
- 30. Plaintiffs owed and owe no duty to defend or indemnify MGA in connection with the Underlying Action under the 1999 Excess Policy, the 2000 Excess Policy, 2001 Excess Policy, the 2002 Excess Policy, the 2003 Excess Policy, the 2004 Excess Policy, the 2005 Excess Policy, and the 2006 and 2007 Primary Policies.

1	31. Plaintiffs are entitled to a declaration that they owed and owe no duty
2	to defend or indemnify MGA in connection with the Underlying Action under the
3	1999 Excess Policy, the 2000 Excess Policy, 2001 Excess Policy, the 2002 Excess
4	Policy, the 2003 Excess Policy, the 2004 Excess Policy, the 2005 Excess Policy, and
5	the 2006 and 2007 Primary Policies.
6	<u>COUNT II</u>
7	<u>DECLARATORY RELIEF</u>
8	(Prior Publication Exclusion Bars Coverage)
9	32. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation contained in
10	Paragraphs 1 through 31 as though fully set forth at length herein.
11	33. The Policies also exclude from coverage any claims arising out of the
12	oral or written publication of material whose first publication took place before the
13	beginning of the policy period.
14	34. The undisputed facts in the Bryant Action establish that the first
15	publication of the allegedly infringing Carter Bryant sketches took place in 2000.
16	Isaac Larian, the CEO of MGA, testified under oath that the Bratz sketches/two-
17	dimensional prototypes were first exhibited in the United States in November of
18	2000. In addition, Isaac Larian testified that presentations of Carter Bryant's
19	sketches and two-dimensional Bratz doll prototypes were used to market Bratz to
20	Kmart and Target in November of 2000. Moreover, an email was sent December
21	14, 2000 to a Walmart buying agent in China and Hong Kong that attached
22	drawings of the Bratz dolls with Carter Bryant's signature. The undisputed facts
23	from the Bryant Action establish that MGA first published the infringing drawings
24	and sketches in 2000.
25	35. Because the first publication of the material claimed to infringe Belair's
26	copyrights occurred in 2000, the prior publication exclusion bars coverage for the
27	copyright infringement claims in the Belair Action under the 2001 to 2007 Policies.
28	

LAW OFFICES
DRINKER BIDDLE &
REATH LLP
Los Angeles

LA01/ 344804.I

- 36. Plaintiffs owed and owe no duty to defend or indemnify MGA in connection with the Underlying Action under the 2001 Excess Policy, the 2002 Excess Policy, the 2003 Excess Policy, the 2004 Excess Policy, the 2005 Excess Policy, the 2006 Excess Policy, the 2007 Excess Policy and the 2006 and 2007 Primary Policies.
- 37. Plaintiffs are entitled to a declaration that they owed and owe no duty to defend or indemnify MGA in connection with the Underlying Action under the 2001 Excess Policy, the 2002 Excess Policy, the 2003 Excess Policy, the 2004 Excess Policy, the 2005 Excess Policy, the 2006 Excess Policy, the 2007 Excess Policy and the 2006 and 2007 Primary Policies.

#### **COUNT III**

#### DECLARATORY RELIEF

#### (No Coverage Under 1999 Excess Policy)

- 38. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 37 as though fully set forth at length herein.
- 39. With respect to the 1999 Excess Policy, the allegations of copyright infringement against MGA are all premised on MGA's making and selling Bratz dolls and other Bratz toys, games and videos and by making derivative works based on the Belair images. Based on the undisputed testimony from the Bryant Action, as described in Paragraph 34 above, MGA first published the allegedly infringing Carter Bryant sketches after the expiration of the 1999 Excess Policy. Indeed, the Bratz sketches/two-dimensional prototypes were first exhibited in the United States in November of 2000. Thus, to the extent that the Amended Complaint alleges copyright infringement arising solely out of the insured's advertisement, which AIU does not concede, any such injury could not have taken place until after November 2000. Accordingly, the alleged copyright infringement could not have occurred during the policy term of the 1999 Excess Policy and coverage is barred.

LA01/344804.1

- 40. Plaintiffs owed and owe no duty to defend or indemnify MGA in connection with the Underlying Action under the 1999 Excess Policy.
- 41. Plaintiffs are entitled to a declaration that they owed and owe no duty to defend or indemnify MGA in connection with the Underlying Action under the 1999 Excess Policy.

#### **COUNT IV**

#### **DECLARATORY RELIEF**

#### (No Coverage For Claims of Copyright Infringement)

- 42. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 41 as though fully set forth at length herein.
- 43. Per Endorsement 4, Exclusion L, "Intellectual Property", of the 2006 Excess Policy and the 2007 Excess Policy, the Personal Injury and Advertising Injury definition was amended to delete the offenses of "the use of another's advertising idea in your Advertisement" and "infringement upon another's copyright, trade dress or slogan in your Advertisement". Accordingly, the Underlying Action does not allege Personal Injury and Advertising Injury as those terms are defined by the 2006 Excess Policy and the 2007 Excess Policy.
- 44. Even if the Underlying Action asserted a claim arising out of one or more of the Personal Injury and Advertising Injury offenses arising solely out of MGA's advertising during the policy periods of the 2006 Excess Policy and the 2007 Excess Policy, which Plaintiffs dispute, Exclusion L., indicates that these Policies do not apply to any liability arising out of or directly or indirectly related to the actual or alleged publication or utterance or oral or written statements which are claimed as an infringement, violation or defense of copyright, patent, trade secrets, trade dress or trademark, service mark, certification mark, collective mark or trade name.
- 45. Because Exclusion L of the 2006 Excess Policy and the 2007 Excess Policy bars coverage for copyright infringement, there is no coverage under the

LA01/344804.1

28

LAW OFFICES
DRINKER BIDDLE &

REATH LLP Los Angeles

1	51. Plaintiffs owed and owe no duty to defend or indemnify MGA in					
2	connection with the Underlying Action under the 2006 and 2007 Primary and					
3	Excess Policies.					
4	52. Plaintiffs are entitled to a declaration that they owed and owe no duty					
5	to defend or indemnify MGA in connection with the Underlying Action under the					
6	2006 and 2007 Primary and Excess Policies.					
7	<u>COUNT VI</u>					
8	<u>DECLARATORY RELIEF</u>					
9	(No Exhaustion of Retained Limits)					
10	53. Plaintiffs repeat and reiterate each and every allegation contained in					
11	Paragraphs 1 through 52 as though fully set forth at length herein.					
12	54. The 2000 Excess Policy is only potentially implicated upon exhaustion					
13	of the Retained Limit, as defined in the policy.					
14	55. Coverage is not provided to MGA for the claims asserted in the					
15	Underlying Action under the 2000 Excess Policies because MGA has not met its					
16	burden of establishing that the 2000 Excess Policy's underlying Retained Limits					
17	have been exhausted.					
18	56. Accordingly, Plaintiffs are entitled to a declaration that they owed and					
19	owe no current duty to defend or indemnify MGA in connection with the 2000					
20	Excess Policy.					
21	PRAYER FOR RELIEF					
22	WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for declaratory judgment finding:					
23	1. Plaintiffs have no obligation to defend or indemnify MGA in					
24	connection with the Underlying Action;					
25	2. For such other relief as the Court may deem proper and just in					
26	the circumstances.					
27	// <i>i</i>					
28	//i					
	LA01/344804.1 11					

LAW OFFICES
DRINKER BIDDLE &
REATH LLP
Los Angeles

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF

## Case 1:12-cv-03677-SAS Document 1 Filed 03/31/10 Page 13 of 18

	~	
1	DATED: March 31, 2010	DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
2		,
3		By: Willed Dr.
4		William A. Hanssen Suzanne V. Stouder
5		
6		Attorneys for Plaintiffs LEXINGTON INSURANCE COMPANY, NATIONAL UNION FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY OF
7		PITTSBURGH, PA; AMERICAN
8		INTERNATIONAL UNDERWRITERS INSURANCE
9		COMPANY AND CHARTIS SPECIALTY INSURANCE COMPANY
11		COMPANI
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25 26		
27		
28		
s	LA01/344804.1	12
E &:	COMPLAINT F	FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF

LAW OFFICES
DRINKER BIDDLE &
REATH LLP
Los Angeles

### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

#### NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT TO UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR DISCOVERY

This case has been assigned to District Judge Philip S. Gutierrez and the assigned discovery Magistrate Judge is Carla Woehrle.

The case number on all documents filed with the Court should read as follows:

CV10- 2355 PSG (CWx)

Pursuant to General Order 05-07 of the United States District Court for the Central District of California, the Magistrate Judge has been designated to hear discovery related

1	notions.				
F	All discovery related motion	ns sho	uld be noticed on the calendar	of th	e Magistrate Judge
=	=========	=======================================		==	========
			NOTICE TO COUNSEL		
A co	$p_{P,Y}$ of this notice must be served, a copy of this notice must be s	l with th erved o	e summons and complaint on all dei n all plaintiffs).	fendar	nts (if a removal action is
Sub	sequent documents must be file	d at the	following location:		
[X]	Western Division 312 N. Spring St., Rm. G-8 Los Angeles, CA 90012		Southern Division 411 West Fourth St., Rm. 1-053 Santa Ana, CA 92701-4516		Eastern Division 3470 Twelfth St., Rm. 134 Riverside, CA 92501
Failu	re to file at the proper location will re	esult in y	our documents being returned to you.		
	8 (03/06) NOTICE OF AS	SIGNME	NT TO LINITED STATES MAGISTRATE		E FOR DISCOVERY

Case 1:12-cv-03677-SAS Documer William A. Hanssen (SBN 11061 Suzanne V. Stouder (SBN 161077) DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP 333 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1650 Los Angeles, CA 90071-1504 Telephone: (213) 253-2300	nt 1 Filed 03/31/10 Page 15 of 18
UNITED STATES I CENTRAL DISTRIC	
LEXINGTON INSURANCE COMPANY, NATIONAL UNION FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY OF PITTSBURGH, PA, AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL UNDERWRITERS INSURANCE COMPANY, AND CHARTIS SPECIALTY INSURANCE COMPANY PLAINTIFF(S) V.	CV10 2355 <b>→</b> (1000)
MGA ENTERTAINMENT, INC.  DEFENDANT(S).	SUMMONS
TO:DEFENDANT(S): MGA ENTERTAINMENT, INC  A lawsuit has been filed against you.  Within 2 days after service of this summons on you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached counterclaim cross-claim or a motion under Rule or motion must be served on the plaintiff's attorney, Wildernue, Suite 1700, Los Angeles, CA 90071-1504. If you against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You	(not counting the day you received it), you complaint amended complaint  12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer liam A. Hanssen, whose address is 333 South Grand ou fail to do so, judgment by default will be entered
	Clerk, U.S. District Court
MAR 3 1  Dated:	By:  Deputy Clerk  (Seal of the Court)
[Use 60 days if the defendant is the United States or a United States 60 days by Rule 12(a)(3)].	agency, or is an officer or employee of the United States. Allowed
CV-01A (12/07) SUMM	1ONS American LegalNet, Inc. www.USCourtForms.com

## Case 1:12-cv-03677-SAS Document 1 Filed 03/31/10 Page 16 of 18 UNITED STATI VISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRIC F CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

		CIVIL COV	ek sheet		
LEXINGTON INSURA INSURANCE COMPA INTERNATIONAL U	x if you are representing yourself [ANCE COMPANY, NATIONANY OF PITTSBURGH, PA, ANDERWRITERS INSURANCE COMPA	DEFENDANTS MGA ENTERTAINM	ENT, INC.		
(b) Attorneys (Firm Name Acyourself, provide same)	ddress and Telephone Number. If y	ou are representing	Attorneys (If Known)		
William A. Hanssen an	d Suzanne V. Stouder	*			
DRINKER BIDDLE &					
333 South Grand Avenu					
Los Angeles, CA 90371					
<del>-</del>					
Telephone: (213) 253-2					
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION	(Place an X in one box only.)		SHIP OF PRINCIPAL PAR (in one box for plaintiff and		s Only
U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party	Citizen of This		F DEF 1 Incorporated or F of Business in th	
2 U.S. Government Defendan	t A Diversity (Indicate Citizer of Parties in Item III)	nship Citizen of Anot	her State	2 2 Incorporated and of Business in A	Principal Place 5 5 5 5
		Citizen or Subje	ect of a Foreign Country	3 3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6
IV. ORIGIN (Place an X in one	box only )				
	ed from 3 Remanded from	4 Reinstated or Reopened	5 Transferred from another of	Dis	Iti- 7 Appeal to District trict Judge from gation Magistrate Judge
V. REQUESTED IN COMPLA CLASS ACTION under F.R.C.I	AINT: JURY DEMAND: Yes P. 23: Yes No		nly if demanded in complain MONEY DEMANDED IN		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (Cite	the U. S. Civil Statute under which	n you are filing and wr	ite a brief statement of cause.	Do not cite jurisdictional st	atutes unless diversity.)
Declaratory Judgment 28					
VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Place	e an X in one box only.)				
OTHER STATUTES	CONTRACT	TORTS	TORTS	PRISONER	LABOR
400 State Reapportionment	☑ 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJUR	7.5 1 235-307 5036 1.3	PETITIONS	710 Fair Labor Standards
410 Antitrust	120 Marine	310 Airplane	PROPERTY	510 Motions to Vacate	
430 Banks and Banking	130 Miller Act	315 Airplane Produ	ct 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending	Sentence Habeas Corpus	720 Labor/Mgmt.
450 Commerce/ICC	140 Negotiable Instrument	Liability 320 Assault, Libel a		530 General	Relations  730 Labor/Mgmt.
Rates/etc.  460 Deportation	Overpayment &	Slander	Property Damag		Reporting &
470 Racketeer Influenced	Enforcement of	330 Fed. Employer			Disclosure Act
and Corrupt	Judgment	Liability	Product Liability		740 Railway Labor Act
Organizations	151 Medicare Act	340 Marine	BANKRUPTCY	550 Civil Rights	790 Other Labor
480 Consumer Credit	152 Recovery of Defaulted	_ 345 Marine Produc Liability	22 Appeal 28 USC 158	555 Prison Condition	Litigation 791 Empl. Ret. Inc.
490 Cable/Sat TV 810 Selective Service	Student Loan (Excl. Veterans)	350 Motor Vehicle	423 Withdrawal 28	FORFEITURE / PENALTY	Security Act
850 Securities/Commodities/	153 Recovery of	355 Motor Vehicle	USC 157	610 Agriculture	PROPERTY RIGHTS
Exchange	Overpayment of	Product Liabili	ty CIVIL RIGHTS	620 Other Food &	820 Copyrights
875 Customer Challenge 12	Veteran's Benefits	_ 360 Other Personal	441 Voting	Drug	830 Patent
USC 3410	☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract	Injury □ 362 Personal Injury	442 Employment	625 Drug Related	SOCIAL SECURITY
890 Other Statutory Actions	195 Contract Product			Seizure of Property 21 USC	
891 Agricultural Act 892 Economic Stabilization	Liability	365 Personal Injury		881	862 Black Lung (923)
Act	☐ 196 Franchise	Product Liabili	ty 445 American with	630 Liquor Laws	863 DIWC/DIWW
893 Environmental Matters	REAL PROPERTY	368 Asbestos Perso	Diodominos	640 R.R.& Truck	405(g))
894 Energy Allocation Act	210 Land Condemnation	Injury Product Liability	Employment	650 Airline Regs	864 SSID Title XVI
895 Freedom of Info. Act	220 Foreclosure	IMMIGRATION	446 American with Disabilities -	660 Occupational Safety /Health	865 RSI (405(g))
900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal	230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land	☐ 462 Naturalization	Other	690 Other	FEDERAL TAX SUITS 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff
Access to Justice	245 Tort Product Liability	Application	440 Other Civil		or Defendant)
950 Constitutionality of State		463 Habeas Corpus	<b>I</b>		871 IRS-Third Party 26
Statutes		Alien Detainee	)		USC 7609
		465 Other Immigrate Actions			
	<u> </u>		P1117	1 2755	
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY.	Casa Number:		- 6V / (	) 2355	

AFTER COMPLETING THE FRONT SIDE OF FORM CV-71, COMPLETE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW.

CV-71 (05/08)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

American LegalNet, Inc. www.Forms.Workflow.com

## Case 1:12-cv-03677-SAS Document 1 Filed 03/31/10 Page 17 of 18 UNITED STATI VISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRIC — F CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

VIII(a). IDENTICAL CASES: Has this action been previously filed in If yes, list case number(s):	this court and dismissed, remanded or closed? No Yes			
VIII(b). RELATED CASES: Have any cases been previously filed in the If yes, list case number(s): EDCV 08-0457; EDCV 08-0458; I				
Civil cases are deemed related if a previously filed case and the prese	nt case:			
Check all boxes that apply)  A. Arise from the same or closely related transactions, happenings, or events; or  B. Call for determination of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or  C. For other reasons would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges; or  D. Involve the same patent, trademark or copyright, and one of the factors identified above in a, b or c also is present.				
IX. VENUE: (When completing the following information, use an additional addi	onal sheet if necessary.)			
(a) List the County in this District; California County outside of this District Check here if the government, its agencies or employees is a named	strict; State if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which <b>EACH</b> named plaintiff resides. plaintiff. If this box is checked, go to item (b).			
County in this District:*	California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreigr. Country			
	Lexington-Massachusetts National Union- New York AIU- New York Chartis Specialty- New York			
(b) List the County in this District; California County outside of this Dis Check here if the government, its agencies or employees is a named	strict; State if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named defendant resides. defendant. If this box is checked, go to item (c).			
County in this District:*	California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country			
MGA- Van Nuys, California- Los Angeles County				
(c) List the County in this District; California County outside of this Dis Note: In land condemnation cases, use the location of the tract o	strict; State if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH claim arose.			
County in this District:*	California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country			
Los Angeles County				
* Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside, Ventura, Santa Ba Note: In land condemnation cases, use the location of the pract of land inv				
X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY (OR PRO PER): William A. Han	Date March 31, 2010			
or other papers as required by law. This form, approved by the Judicia	nd the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings of Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3 -1 is not filed use and initiating the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet.)			

CV-71 (05/08)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

Page 2 of 2

American LegalNet, Inc. www.Forms.Workflow.com

## Case 1:12-cv-03677-SAS Document 1 Filed 03/31/10 Page 18 of 18 Key to Statistical codes relating to Social Security Case

Nature of Suit Code	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement of Cause of Action
861	HIA	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the program. (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))
862	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. (30 U.S.C. 923)
863	DIWC	All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))
863	DIWW	All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))
864	SSID	All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security Act, as amended.
865	RSI	All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. (g))

CV-71 (05/08)